

REPORT CONCERNING A RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS IN AESTHETICS

Ken-ichi SASAKI

0 The Research Questionnaire

Since 1987, in a class on general theory in aesthetics I hold at the University of Tokyo every two years, I have used a special format : every week, I give an explication of one fundamental concept in aesthetics, so that, by the end of the year, my students might have a general and elementary idea of our discipline. At the beginning, the problem was how to choose about 25 concepts. Following my own choice temporarily, I developed the idea of doing a questionnaire in order to know what is a "standard" choice, if there could be one.

To realize this plan, I took advantage of the two international congresses held in England one after another in the summer of 1988 : the XVIIIth International Congress for Philosophy in Brighton and the Xth International Congress for Aesthetics in Nottingham. Attending both congresses, I put many copies of my questionnaire on the desk of the main hall of the congress; further, in Nottingham, I asked my friends to collaborate to my research. Just after that, I used the same questionnaire with my Japanese colleagues on the occasion of the 39th Annual Meeting of the Japanese Society for Aesthetics, held at the Doshisha University in Kyoto. My letter of request was the following (the English of the text is corrected) :

REQUEST FOR COOPERATION ON A RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

We seem to live at a turning point in the history of aesthetics. In this situation, I hope to specify the fundamental concepts in aesthetics today: I mean by "fundamental concepts" the ones the knowledge of which we take for indispensable in order to do technical research in philosophical aesthetics.

I ask that you choose thirty aesthetic concepts you think most fundamental, distinguishing among them three grades of importance : 1 for the first ten concepts, 2 for the second ten and 3 for the third ten. I present you with about a hundred concepts in English, disregarding eventual nuances in different languages. If you find in this list the concepts of your choice, please score them with 1 or 2 or 3. If you don't find there the concepts you prefer, please add your choice with its score in the blank space after the list : and if you cite this term in another language than English, French or German, please give its meaning in English.

You don't have to mention your name and address, but please specify the other data, which are indispensable for the statistics. If you inform me of your name and address, I would like to send you the results. I'll be very happy to receive your completed question-

naire at the Congress stand; you may also send it back to me at the following adress.

Thank you for your cooperation.

[My adress and a sample entry]

Here you have the list of concepts put in alphabetical order : *abstract and figurative - academism - aesthetic categories - aesthetic consciousness - aesthetic existence - aesthetic experience - aesthetic judgement - aesthetic idea - aesthetics - architecture - art - "l'art pour l'art" - assimilation and alienation - beauty - beauty of nature - "catharsis" - classic and baroque - "cliché" - code - comic - communication - comparative aesthetics/comparative science of art - composite art(Gesamtkunstwerk) - composition/structure - convention - creation/invention - criticism - danse - decoration - "decorum" - dimension - dramatic - education - experiment - expression - evidence - feeling - festivities - film - form and content - general and particular - genius - "genres" - grace - harmony - history - history of aesthetics - humour - iconography and iconology - ideal and real - illusion - imagination - imitation(imitatio) - impression - improvisation - inspiration/enthusiasm - institution - interest/disinterestedness - interpretation - intuition - irony - literature - "matière" - "métier" - mode - mood - music - originality - painting - passion - parody - performance - perspective - play - pleasure - proportion/symmetry - point of view - public - purity - reception - representation (mimêsis) - reproduction - rhetorical figures/metaphor - rhythm - romantic - science of art - sculpture - scheme - sensibility - sublime - symbol and sign - sympathy and "Einfühlung" - style and manner - taste - technique - text - theatre - time and space - tradition and "avant-garde" - tragic - ugliness - urbanism - value - verisimilitude - work(œuvre).*

I received finally 29 answers from Western scholars and 27 from Japanese scholars, including those gathered kindly by Professor Bohdan DZIEMIDOK in Gdańsk and Professor Gabriele BERSA in Milan, to whom I express here my special gratitude. I had to omit three answers from the statistical analysis, because they had chosen too many or too few concepts. So finally I had 27 samples from Western scholars and 26 from Japanese. (By the way, for the Japanese, I wrote the request letter in Japanese, but proposed the same list in English.)

Probably the number of replies is too small for an effective statistical analysis. But three years have passed, and I have no other means than to try to utilize these replies. Anyway, these replies have two merits : firstly, they all come from professionnals, in other words, from the most highly qualified persons ; secondly, the number of the replies from Western scholars and that from Japanese are almost the same, so that we can compare directly their numerical values with each other.

I apologize for the delay in this work. During these three years, I tried once to train myself in computerized statistical analysis but without success. I did not have the time to accomplish this work. But, anticipating the next congress in aesthetics, I have forced myself to do at least this. I acknowledge frankly that I am not a professional with statistics, so the following results lack methodology. But, I think I have determined what I wanted to know.

I know that many are sceptical about this sort of research, not because of the problem of the limited number of replies but because of principle. In effect, one professor who accepted to answer the questionnaire raised doubts about the meaning of this research. Preferring, however, first to present the results, I leave to the end of this report the task of responding to these doubts.

1 General Results of the Research Questionnaire

In the first place, I present the general result of the questionnaire : I arrange the concepts according to the order of their scores, noting the respective scores of the Western scholars and the Japanese, and the number of the replies listing the concept in question. (When the replies are the same between more than two concepts, priority is given to the one chosen by more persons ; when the scores and the number of choices are equal, I follow alphabetical order.) Scores are calculated as follows : an answer listing the concept as one of the first ten gets 20 points, one as the second ten 15 points and one as the third ten 10 points. Taking the case of "beauty" for example, I explain how to read the following table. This concept gets 725 points in total, and particularly 255 points from the Western scholars and 470 points from the Japanese. And the number of those who listed it is 15 among the Western scholars and 25 among the Japanese.

This list is exhaustive. But the concepts listed by only one person are grouped at the end. The concept marked with * is the one not offered in the list but proposed by the respondent ; this sort of concept is presented here in principle as proposed by the respondent.

CONCEPT	WESTERN SCHOLARS	JAPANESE SCHOLARS	TOTAL
1 beauty	255/15	470/25	725/40
2 art	265/14	435/23	700/37
3 creation/invention	290/16	365/23	655/39
4 aesthetic experience	295/18	335/23	630/36
5 expression	285/18	285/18	570/36
6 value	260/14	275/17	535/31
7 aesthetic judgement	230/14	300/18	530/32
7 aesthetics	140/ 8	390/20	530/28
9 imagination	205/12	310/20	535/31
10 work(œuvre)	140/ 8	325/19	470/27
11 interpretation	235/15	230/14	465/29
12 aesthetic categories	200/13	250/17	450/30
13 criticism	180/12	265/16	445/28
14 aesthetic consciousness	235/14	200/12	435/26
15 communication	250/15	175/12	425/27
16 symbol and sign	230/14	185/12	415/26

17	history of aesthetics	185/13	205/12	390/25
18	intuition	195/13	190/12	385/25
19	rhetorical figures/metaphor	215/14	150/11	365/25
19	taste	180/11	185/11	365/22
21	“catharsis”	240/16	110/ 9	350/25
22	beauty of nature	120/ 8	225/16	345/24
23	tradition & “avant-garde”	240/17	90/ 6	330/23
24	composition/structure	195/13	130/11	325/24
24	form and content	130/ 9	195/13	325/22
26	originality	175/12	145/10	320/22
27	feeling	145/13	170/12	315/25
28	aesthetic existence	100/ 6	195/11	295/17
29	pleasure	170/11	110/ 8	280/19
29	text	160/10	120/ 8	280/18
31	sensibility	145/10	130/12	275/22
31	style and manner	140/11	135/ 9	275/20
33	aesthetic idea	95/ 6	175/12	270/18
33	genius	135/10	135/ 8	270/18
35	representation(mimêsis)	90/ 5	170/11	260/16
36	ideal and real	115/ 8	135/ 8	250/16
36	sympathy and “Einfühlung”	155/10	95/ 6	250/16
38	play	135/10	110/ 9	245/19
38	comparative aesthetics...	130/ 9	115/ 9	245/18
40	education	160/10	80/ 5	240/15
41	illusion	140/10	90/ 7	230/17
42	convention	170/12	55/ 5	225/17
43	music	155/10	65/ 5	220/15
43	time and space	115/ 8	105/ 7	220/15
45	imitation(imitatio)	70/ 6	140/10	210/16
45	history	75/ 5	135/ 9	210/14
47	code	145/10	60/ 4	205/14
47	painting	125/ 8	80/ 6	205/14
49	technique	85/ 6	115/ 8	200/14
50	architecture	110/ 8	75/ 6	185/14
50	performance	100/ 7	85/ 7	185/14
50	inspiration/enthusiasm	130/ 9	55/ 3	185/12
53	harmony	80/ 6	100/ 8	180/14
53	verisimilitude	90/ 7	90/ 7	180/14
53	irony	155/11	25/ 2	180/13
53	reception	125/ 8	55/ 4	180/12
57	abstract & figurative	80/ 5	95/ 7	175/12

58	iconography & iconology	95/ 7	75/ 6	170/13
58	sublime	120/ 8	55/ 4	175/12
60	tragic	115/ 9	50/ 4	165/13
61	theatre	105/ 7	50/ 3	55/10
62	passion	75/ 5	70/ 6	145/11
62	reproduction	55/ 4	90/ 7	145/11
62	rhythm	70/ 6	75/ 5	145/11
62	ugliness	90/ 6	55/ 5	145/11
66	literature	100/ 7	40/ 3	140/10
66	assimilation & alienation	125/ 8	15/ 1	140/ 9
66	science of art	35/ 2	105/ 6	140/ 8
69	“métier”	80/ 6	55/ 5	135/11
69	experiment	115/ 8	20/ 1	135/ 9
71	institution	60/ 6	70/ 5	130/11
71	film	110/ 8	20/ 2	130/10
73	“genres”	35/ 3	90/ 6	125/ 9
73	impression	60/ 4	65/ 4	125/ 8
75	“l’art pour l’art”	70/ 5	50/ 4	120/ 9
75	romantic	110/ 8	10/ 1	120/ 9
75	interest/disinterestedness	55/ 3	65/ 4	120/ 7
78	comic	95/ 7	20/ 2	115/ 9
78	mode	100/ 8	15/ 1	115/ 9
78	sculpture	70/ 5	45/ 4	115/ 9
78	point of view	90/ 6	25/ 2	115/ 8
82	public	40/ 3	65/ 4	105/ 7
83	perspective	30/ 3	70/ 5	100/ 8
83	humour	90/ 6	10/ 1	100/ 7
85	classic & baroque	55/ 4	40/ 3	95/ 7
86	“decorum”	65/ 5	25/ 2	90/ 7
86	decoration	35/ 2	55/ 4	90/ 6
88	improvisation	80/ 6	0/ 0	80/ 6
89	urbanism	55/ 4	20/ 2	75/ 6
90	dramatic	60/ 6	10/ 1	70/ 7
90	danse	70/ 5	0/ 0	70/ 5
92	“cliché”	55/ 5	10/ 1	65/ 6
93	composite art (Gesamtkunstwerk)	60/ 5	0/ 0	60/ 5
93	aesthetic/aesthetic qualities*	20/ 1	40/ 2	60/ 3
95	mood	35/ 3	20/ 2	55/ 5
95	scheme	40/ 4	15/ 1	55/ 5
95	purity	30/ 2	25/ 2	55/ 4
95	parody	55/ 3	0/ 0	55/ 3

99	academism	20/ 2	30/ 3	50/ 5
99	proportion/symmetry	25/ 2	25/ 2	50/ 4
101	festivities	30/ 2	10/ 1	40/ 3
101	general and particular	25/ 2	15/ 1	40/ 3
103	dimension	25/ 2	10/ 1	35/ 3
104	grace	10/ 1	20/ 2	30/ 3
104	truth/truth beauty*	0/ 0	30/ 2	30/ 2
106	evaluation*	25/ 2	0/ 0	25/ 2
107	concepts which get 20/ 1 : appearance(Schein)*, artistic practice*, appreciation*, body*, composition & decomposition*, contestation*, daily*, deconstruction*, difference*, image*, liberation*, media*, modern & postmodern*, multiplicity*, rightness*, worldmaking*.			
123	concepts which get 15/ 1 : autonomy*, design*, desire*, ethic beauty*, evidence, experience of work of art*, function*, "kairos"* , language*, meaning*, perception*, suspense*.			
135	concepts which get 10/ 1 : "l'art pour la vie"* , compensation*, "Denkstil"* , formation(Gestaltung)*, semiotics*, sociology*, tragi-comic*.			

It is quite difficult to provide any interpretation of this ranking, because we do not have a basic reference point. Besides, it does not seem to be very different from our expectations. However, I have some comments.

Firstly, the concepts which I had not listed and which were presented by the respondents, naturally have a large handicap : if they had been listed, they would have gotten many more points. In this sense, I ought probably to have done a preliminary investigation to know what repertory of concepts to present.

Secondly, the concepts which contain an adjective "aesthetic" seem to be accepted favorably by this fact itself. The case of "aesthetic consciousness" is striking. It is apparently out of date as a technical term. The *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, for example, does not give it an article. We might be able to doubt whether respondents who chose it were conscious of the fact that this expression meant quite the same thing as "aesthetic experience". In fact, 19 persons chose "aesthetic consciousness" and "aesthetic experience" at the same time. "Aesthetic existence" is also dubious as to its qualifications for being a technical term : I don't think this concept has a standard acceptance.

The case of "aesthetics" itself is also striking, but in the opposite sense. I wonder why so few persons chose it especially among the Western scholars? Is it because this concept is self-evident, or because they are indifferent to its conceptual comprehension? It seems to me that these options come to one and the same : they are indifferent because they consider it self-evident. Besides, it is what we can read from the list itself.

What is then aesthetics? Casting a glance at the list, aesthetics seems always, as in Baumgarten's time, to be the science or philosophy of beauty or art. But reading more attentively, we are surprised by the contrast between the scores given these two concepts by

the Western scholars and the Japanese : they owe their priority in the list only to the extraordinary high points the Japanese give to them. In fact, 25 Japanese out of 26 choose “beauty” and 23 “art”! From the point of view of the Japanese, Occidental aesthetics seems probably to have lost its center. It appears that the most significant factor in this list consists in the contrast between the Western scholars and the Japanese. So I would like to re-arrange the list and to present comparatively two rankings, that of the Western scholars and that of the Japanese.

2 East and West in Contemporary Aesthetics

Here you have the comparative lists of the best thirties:

WESTERN SCHOLARS		JAPANESE SCHOLARS		
1	aesthetic experience	295/18	1 beauty	470/25
2	creation/invention	290/16	2 art	435/23
3	expression	265/18	3 aesthetics	390/20
4	art	265/14	4 creation/invention	365/23
5	value	260/14	5 aesthetic experience	335/18
6	beauty	255/15	6 work(œuvre)	325/19
7	communication	250/15	7 imaginaton	310/20
8	tradition & “avant-garde”	240/17	8 aesthetic judgement	300/18
8	“catharsis”	240/16	9 expression	285/18
10	aesthetic consciousness	235/14	10 value	276/17
10	interpretation	235/15	11 criticism	265/16
12	aesthetic judgement	230/14	12 aesthetic categories	250/17
12	symbol & sign	230/14	13 interpretation	230/14
14	rhetorical figures...	215/14	14 beauty of nature	225/16
15	imagination	205/12	15 history of aesthetics	205/12
16	aesthetic categories	200/13	16 aesthetic consciousness	200/12
17	composition/structure	195/13	17 form and content	195/13
17	intuition	195/13	17 aesthetic existence	195/11
19	history of aesthetics	185/13	19 intuition	190/12
20	criticism	180/12	20 symbol and sign	185/12
20	taste	180/11	20 taste	185/11
22	originality	175/12	22 aesthetic idea	175/12
23	convention	170/12	22 communication	175/12
23	pleasure	170/11	24 feeling	170/12
25	education	160/10	24 representation	170/12
25	text	160/10	26 rhetorical figures...	150/11
27	irony	155/11	27 originality	145/10
27	music	155/10	28 imitation(mimêsis)	140/10
27	sympathy & “Einfühlung”	155/10	29 genius	135/10

30	feeling	145/13	29	history	135/ 9
30	code	145/10	29	style and manner	135/ 9
30	sensibility	145/10	29	ideal and real	135/ 8

We have already noticed above the tendency in the Japanese list to concentrate on the two star concepts, beauty and art. In fact, the contrast is really remarkable : the Japanese tend to give their points to a limited number of main concepts, whereas the Western scholars spread their scores among more numerous concepts. The respective scores of the first concepts are 470 : 295 ; the scores are the same for the 22th concepts ; and the ratio becomes inverse for the 30th concepts as 135 : 145. To quantify this ratio of decline, we may compare the scores of the tenth, the twentieth and the thirtieth concepts to the scores of the first one, and get the following table:

	The 10th	The 20th	The 30th
Western scholars	-20%	-39%	-51%
Japanese	-41%	-61%	-71%
Total	-35%	-50%	-61%

The larger ratio of decline signifies that the scores are concentrated on a small number of concepts, and consequently that there exists a repertory of basic concepts commonly recognized. We ought probably to add the remark that among the concepts I proposed, there are five which get no points in the chart of the Japanese : composite art, danse, evidence, improvisation, parody ; and that there is no zero point concept in the chart of the Western scholars. These facts strongly suggest the existence of, if I may say so, a scholastic aesthetics in Japan.

The Japanese aesthetics in question is not a traditional one based on Japanese culture as such, but one based on occidental philosophy. Nevertheless, Japan is the only country in the world that has independant departments of aesthetics in many universities. And the Japanese Society for Aesthetics founded in 1949 is, as far as I know, the largest society specialised in this discipline. This situation has naturally led to an interest in construction of a standard for aesthetics.

I would like to make special mention of the role a book has played in the standardization of aesthetics in Japan. I mean *Bigaku-jiten*, literally Encyclopedia of Aesthetics, or rather I might translate it as Encyclopedic Handbook of Aesthetics, edited by Toshio TAKEUCHI, 1961¹, 518+39pp. I think this handbook has contributed much more strongly than any individual work to establish the standard for aesthetics. (Two Chinese translations of this book have recently been published.)

By the way, the high score of "beauty" among the Japanese cannot be explained only by culture. Even if one admits the existence of a culture of beauty in Japan, this culture is so to speak institutionalized through the naming of our discipline itself : "Bigaku", the word used in Japanese to designate aesthetics, signifies really not the science of "aisthêsis" but the sci-

ence of beauty.

I would now like to note those concepts whose estimation differs remarkably between the Western scholars and the Japanese.

In the Japanese chart, after the case of "aesthetics" mentioned above, that of "work(œuvre)"(325 : 140) is striking ; it interests me especially because of my book *Philosophy of Work*(1985). But it is more interesting to compare its score by Western scholars with their scores in the charts of "Under Forties" and "Specialists", which I will present below.

As to "beauty of nature"(225 : 120), we may take in consideration cultural tradition as well as the fact that, in the "science of beauty", "beauty of nature" has the same title to being the main subject matter as "beauty of art".

"Aesthetic idea"(175 : 95) is probably ambiguous ; there might be persons who chose it in the sense of artistic conception. But I think that this number reflects the strong presence of the aesthetics of Kant in the scholastic aesthetics of Japan. We might be able to read also the scholastic character of Japanese aesthetics in "representation"(170 : 90), and in "imitation"(140 : 70). I have no explanation for the moment of "history"(135 : 75), which does not appear in the chart of "Specialists". We can hardly base it on the influence of the historian of art. Among the nine persons who chose it, there are only two historians of art, the aestheticians count three, and the rest did not mention their specialities.

In the chart of the Western scholars, striking are such newer concepts as "convention"(170 : 55) and "code"(145 : 60). As to "text" which is often opposed to "work(œuvre)", its score(160) is higher than that of "work"(140), but compared to those in the Japanese chart(120), it is not so high as one might expect when thinking of the result of "work".

We ought to give special attention to "education"(160 : 80) and "irony"(155 : 25) as aspects of the status of aesthetics in the West. In relation to "irony", we refer to "humour"(90 : 10) and "parody"(55 : 0) : we may read here, rather an aspect of Japanese culture.

3 Specialists of Aesthetics

We may expect to find a concentration of certain preferences from the specialists of aesthetics. So I present here the chart of the specialists ; I mean by "specialists" those who indicated that their speciality is aesthetics or philosophy of art, including aesthetics of a particular art as that of music, and I did not exclude those who mentioned plural specialities including aesthetics. We have here 14 Western cases and 16 Japanese. The following list adopts the same manner of presentation ; but here, I add in parentheses the proportional value, that is to say the score expected for this number of respondents on the basis of the score in the above general list. For example, in the case of "art" in the following list, 9 Western specialists chose it and gave it 175 points ; but, calculating proportionally from the scores of the general list, the value should be 137 ($265 \times 14 / 27$) : 265 is the score for "art" in the general list, 27 the number of the total Western respondents, and 14 that of the Western specialists.

	WESTERN SCHOLARS	JAPANESE	TOTAL
1 art	175/ 9 (137)	280/14 (268)	455/23 (396)
2 beauty	115/ 4 (132)	405/20 (289)	405/24 (410)
3 value	205/11 (135)	180/12 (166)	385/23 (303)
4 creation/invention	140/ 8 (150)	215/13 (225)	355/21 (371)
5 aesthetic experience	180/10 (127)	165/ 9 (206)	345/19 (356)
6 aesthetic judgement	135/ 8 (119)	190/11 (185)	325/19 (300)
7 aesthetics	90/ 5 (73)	230/12 (240)	320/17 (300)
8 interpretation	155/10 (122)	160/10 (142)	315/20 (264)
9 work(œuvre)	95/ 5 (73)	210/12 (200)	305/17 (266)
10 aesthetic categories	140/ 9 (104)	155/10 (154)	295/19 (255)
10 symbol & sign	160/10 (119)	135/ 9 (114)	295/19 (235)
12 expression	100/ 7 (145)	190/12 (175)	290/19 (323)
13 imagination	90/ 6 (106)	200/13 (191)	290/19 (291)
14 criticism	120/ 7 (93)	155/10 (163)	275/17 (252)
15 aesthetic consciousness	125/ 7 (122)	125/ 8 (123)	250/15 (246)
16 communication	140/ 8 (130)	105/ 7 (108)	240/15 (241)
17 history of aesthetics	110/ 8 (122)	125/ 8 (126)	235/16 (221)
18 beauty of nature	95/ 5 (62)	130/11 (138)	225/16 (195)
19 intuition	80/ 6 (101)	140/ 9 (117)	220/15 (218)
19 tradition & "avant-garde"	155/10 (124)	65/ 4 (55)	220/14 (187)
21 aesthetic idea	75/ 5 (49)	130/ 9 (108)	205/14 (153)
21 aesthetic existence	85/ 4 (52)	130/ 9 (120)	205/12 (167)
22 rhetorical figures...	100/ 7 (111)	100/ 7 (92)	200/14 (207)
23 composition/structure	105/ 7 (101)	85/ 7 (80)	190/14 (184)
23 taste	55/ 4 (93)	135/ 9 (113)	190/13 (207)
25 form & content	65/ 5 (67)	120/ 8 (120)	185/13 (184)
26 representation(mimêsis)	50/ 3 (47)	125/ 8 (105)	175/11 (147)
27 performance	80/ 6 (52)	85/ 7 (52)	165/13 (105)
27 text	110/ 7 (83)	55/ 4 (74)	165/11 (157)
29 comparative aesthetics...	100/ 7 (67)	60/ 4 (71)	160/11 (139)
29 technique	45/ 3 (44)	115/ 8 (71)	160/11 (113)

Here also we have the following ratio of decline, only the calculation is limited to the 20th, because the value of the 30th should be too small to be reliable.

	The 10th	The 20th
Western scholars	-34%	-51%
Japanese	-46%	-56%
Total	-35%	-52%

It is interesting that specialization contributes to amending the general tendency on both sides : the Western specialists strengthen the ratio of decline of the general chart from 20 to 34 (the 10th) and from 39 to 51 (the 20th) ; by contrast, the Japanese weaken it from 61 to 56 at least at the 20th rank. Thus, the total ratio is almost the same because of this compensation. This tendency could be interpreted as a movement of specification on both sides : through concentration on the side of the Western scholars, and through diffusion of the too much concentrated interest of common sense on the side of the Japanese. Typical is the case of "aesthetic experience" : the Western specialists score it 41.8% stronger than the proportionally expected value, and the Japanese specialists 20% weaker.

Looking more closely, we notice first of all the change in the first concept : the specialists regard art instead of beauty as the main subject of aesthetics. Specifically, the Western specialists award "art" 27.7% more points and "beauty" 12.9% less, in comparison with the proportionally expected values.

Generally speaking, on the side of the Western scholars, the cases where scores are strengthened are striking : "aesthetic existence"(63.5%), "beauty of nature"(53.2%), "aesthetic idea"(53%), "value"(51.8%), "comparative aesthetics"(49.2%), "aesthetic categories"(34.6%), "symbol & sign"(34.5%), "text"(32.5%), "work(œuvre)"(30.1%) and so on. Conversely, weaker scores are given to "expression"(31%), "taste"(30%) and "intuition"(18.8%).

On the side of the Japanese, there is only one concept to which the specialists give a strikingly stronger point : "technique"(62%). We may read in it a reflection of the traditional evaluation of the artisanal. Among the weakened scores, we find "text"(25.7%) and "taste"(20.6%) ; probably, "text" is a non-specialist concept in the field of aesthetics, and specialists are more sensitive to the fact that "taste" is an obsolete concept.

4 Younger Generations

Younger generations are always more sensitive to a new trend. Setting the border line at the age of forty, I present below an "Under 40 list" ; we have here 12 Western replies and 8 Japanese. The form of presentation is the same as the "Specialists list".

	WESTERN SCHOLARS	JAPANESE	TOTAL
1 beauty	110/ 7 (113)	145/ 8 (145)	255/15 (274)
2 art	120/ 6 (118)	130/ 7 (133)	250/13 (261)
3 aesthetic experience	140/ 8 (131)	90/ 6 (103)	230/14 (236)
4 value	95/ 5 (116)	115/ 6 (95)	210/11 (200)
5 creation/invention	85/ 5 (129)	120/ 8 (112)	205/13 (245)
6 expression	125/ 8 (127)	70/ 5 (87)	195/13 (213)
7 aesthetic judgement	95/ 6 (102)	95/ 6 (92)	190/12 (198)
8 interpretation	100/ 6 (104)	85/ 5 (70)	185/11 (174)
9 convention	135/ 9 (76)	45/ 4 (14)	180/13 (84)
10 symbol & sign	125/ 8 (102)	55/ 3 (57)	180/11 (155)

11	intuition	75/ 5 (87)	100/ 6 (58)	175/11 (144)
11	work(œuvre)	85/ 5 (62)	90/ 5 (100)	175/10 (176)
13	rhetorical figures...	80/ 6 (95)	90/ 6 (46)	170/12 (137)
13	composition/structure	115/ 7 (87)	55/ 4 (40)	170/11 (122)
15	criticism	65/ 5 (80)	95/ 6 (81)	160/11 (167)
15	taste	90/ 5 (80)	70/ 4 (57)	160/ 9 (137)
17	code	130/ 9 (64)	25/ 2 (18)	155/11 (77)
17	imagination	60/ 3 (91)	95/ 6 (95)	155/ 9 (193)
19	tradition & "avant-garde"	105/ 8 (106)	45/ 3 (28)	150/11 (124)
19	aesthetic categories	95/ 6 (89)	55/ 4 (77)	150/10 (168)

The ratios of decline are the following :

	The 10th	The 20th
Western scholars	-25%	-39%
Japanese	-38%	-62%
Total	-29%	-41%

Curiously these figures are almost the same as those of the "General List". And the scores of the concepts of higher ranking approximatively coincide with the proportionally expected values. This fact may suggest that the members of our younger generations are not really young. But probably the age border line should be adjusted so as to get a contrast ; we have also to take into account that the actually younger people are susceptible to the influence of education. This fact may raise the question who may be considered young in the field of philosophy and science when understood broadly.

However, this chart presents some deviations. Striking is the case of "convention". We know now that almost all scores for this concept were given by the under 40 generation : 45 out of 55 among the Japanese and 135 out of 170 among the Western scholars. So this concept which comes 44th in the general list is now ranked 9th. A similar promotion is given by the younger Western to the concept "code" : they score it 130 out of 145 and so it is promoted from 47th to 17th, and further, in the chart of the younger Western only, it is ranked at third! An association of ideas may lead us from "convention" and "code" to "institution". Its points are 40 and 40 : deviation from the proportionally expected values (27 and 21) is quite strong, but the absolute scores are not so high.

Some cases present contrary movements among West and East. Firstly "creation" and "intuition", whose scores are down among the Westerns and up among the Japanese : the score of 129 points which "creation" gets among the Westerns are 34% below the average ; similarly, "intuition" lost 13,8% among the Westerns and got 72% above the average among the Japanese. The opposite case is found in "work" : younger Westerns score it 61% higher than the proportionally expected score, but it lost 25% of its point among the younger Japanese.

I now enumerate the concepts which greatly deviate above from the proportionally expected

value : “symbol and sign” (22,5% higher among the Westerns), “composition & structure” (32% higher among the Westerns, and 50% higher among the Japanese), “rhetorical figures & metaphor”(73,9% higher among the Japanese), “tradition & ‘avant-garde’”(66.7% higher among the Japanese). Next, the concepts whose deviation is much below the average : “aesthetic categories” (28,6% below among the Japanese) and “imagination”(respectively 17,8 % and 15,8 % below). Being newer and older concepts, these cases are comprehensible. But quite surprising is the case of “taste” : this 18th-century concept scores 12,5 % and 22,8 % above the average in West and East.

Finally, “aesthetics” which occupied the 6th rank in the general list disappears here from the best 20 : 80 (62) - 40 (119) - 120 (200). Note especially that the Japanese score is 58% below the average.

5 Women’s List

At the begining, I had abandoned the plan of preparing a women’s list, because the sample was too small (11). But having tried a calculation, I could not but think that the result was meaningful. The best thing here is to present the list. The total replies are only 11, so it is impossible to divide it into two as I have done till now.

1	art	175/9 (137)	11	aesthetic experience	100/7 (131)
2	taste	140/8 (76)	11	pleasure	100/7 (58)
3	beauty	130/7 (150)	11	aesthetic consiousness	100/6 (90)
4	“catharsis”	120/8 (73)	14	composition/structure	95/6 (67)
4	imagination	120/7 (107)	14	originality	95/6 (66)
6	value	115/6 (111)	16	feeling	90/7 (65)
7	comunication	110/7 (88)	16	interpretation	90/5 (96)
8	music	105/7 (46)	18	history of aesthetics	85/6 (81)
8	rhetorical figures.	105/7 (76)	18	illusion	85/6 (48)
8	creation/invention	105/6 (136)	18	education	85/5 (50)
			18	symbol & sign	85/5 (86)

Here the ratio of decline is rather low : -25% at the 10th and -39% at the 20th. So a dispersive tendency is evident. Nonetheless, we could not deny the very strong character of this chart. To enumerate the concepts whose points exceed 50% above the proportionally expected value : 1^o music (+128%), 2^o taste (+84%), 3^o illusion (+77%), 4^o pleasure (+72%), 5^o education (+70%), 6^o catharsis” (+64%). Above all, the position of “music” and “taste” is striking. (Women are inclined generally to give high points to particular genres of art : “painting” 75 (+74%) and “literature” 70 (+141%).) Probably we might read in this a sensualist tendency ; but as regards music, we must also take into consideration the fact that “composition/structure” gets 42% higher points.

6 Significance of the Research Questionnaire

It is true that one questionnaire above cannot give us the latest trend : for a genuine historical account, a temporal span is necessary. We should try the same inquiry at ten or twenty year intervals. However, even this one attempt, I believe, shows, for example, that the new trend has not invaded the heart of the discipline, that change or evolution happens slowly in spite of several sensational clamours we hear around us. The special form of the discipline in Japan and certain characteristic tendencies among women are also undeniable.

But, as I have indicated at the beginning, there are sceptical doubts about this sort of research. I would like to present here the doubt expressed by a woman philosopher. It consists in the disparity or heterogeneity among the concepts. There are terms for the "genres" of art such as "music" and "theater", those for the value or quality such as "beauty" and "ugliness", and theoretical concepts such as "imitation" and "institution" etc. How are we to compare them and differentiate their relative importance, she asks. In her opinion, the choice and the differentiation of importance can not be very precise. She expresses very well the viewpoint of the respondent, which I understand. The respondent is asked to make a clearcut solution against his or her will. We should also suppose an uneasiness the respondent might feel about his or her personal thoughts being levelled off into an anonymous collectivity.

In my opinion, the problem depends finally upon whether we trust in the existence of a collectivity. The opinion of a collectivity is the opinion of nobody, it is true even if it concerns the scholarly community ; but it is, at the same time, an opinion of everybody. My opinion is not completely coextensive with this collective opinion ; but the opinion of the collectivity is not completely indifferent to my opinion either. My hesitation and indecisiveness about this choice is more or less reflected in the statistical diffusion of the collective choices. It is true that the numbers do not resolve my personal problem. But they express something which concerns me as well as many others ; and it is something important. So I believe in its relevance and significance.

The University of Tokyo